**REMARKS**

The sole issue raised in the outstanding Office Action is an obviousness rejection of claims 22-44 under 35 USC §103(a) over German Patent Publication No. 10042283 to Kirjuchin in view of Japanese Patent Publication No. 2000/356919 to Toshinori et al. and Japanese Patent Publication No. 61-167352 to Kumazawa. It should be noted that the Examiner refers to Kirjuchin as reference number 2002-363791. Also, the Examiner refers to Japanese Publication No. 61-167352 as "Ryoji" on page 2 of the Office Action and as "Kumazawa" on page 3 of the Office Action.

The Examiner cites Kirjuchin for all claim limitations except for a braided wire having 5 to 100 individual wires, the individual wires having an individual wire diameter within a range of from 10 µm to 50 µm, a heat sink and a cooling device. Toshinori et al. is cited for a braided wire having 5 to 100 individual wires, the individual wire diameter being within the range of 10 µm to 50 µm. Kumazawa is cited for a heat sink and a cooling device.

Independent claim 23 recites a core having at least two symmetrical core parts which are opposed to each other and separated by gaps therein to interrupt the magnetic circuit, the gaps each having a gap width within the range of 2mm to 10mm, inclusive, at least one of the gaps being an air gap, all of the gaps having an essentially equal gap width. The Examiner argues that a gap width within the range of 2mm to 10mm "is a design choice depending on intended use." Applicants respectfully disagree.

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Kirjuchin would not use the claimed gap width. The claimed gap width is not inherent and is not a matter of design choice. Kirjuchin is directed to solving problems associated with stray fields. Kirjuchin clearly states that reducing stray fields is the "intended use". One having ordinary skill in the art would have understood that having a larger gap width causes an increase, not a decrease, in stray fields. Accordingly, starting from the teachings of Kirjuchin, one having ordinary skill in the art would choose a gap width as small as possible.

The inventors, not the prior art, developed the claimed inductive component having the claimed gap width.

As described in paragraph [0007] of the substitute specification, the inventors surprisingly found that even if the inductive component is activated using an AC voltage of several hundred volts, the claimed gap width may allow for a relatively high quality Q value.

Therefore, the claimed width may allow the inductive component to have a smaller size in comparison with an inductive component having differently configured gaps.

Neither Toshinori et al. nor Kumazawa compensate for the deficiencies discussed above with regard to Kirjuchin. Accordingly, the claims patentably distinguish over the references, taken alone or in any proper combination, and the prior art rejection should be withdrawn.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this Preliminary Amendment, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: December 29, 2006

By: _____
Mark J. Henry
Registration No. 36,162

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501